

REMARKS

This application, for which an accompanying Request for Continued Examination has been filed, has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 15, 2004. Claims 1 to 8 are in the application, of which Claim 1 is the only independent claim. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, the Examiner's attention is drawn to the accompanying Letter Transmitting Corrected Drawings. Attached to that Letter are replacement drawing sheets which incorporate the drawing changes required by the Office Action. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the drawing objections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,674,010 (Inui). Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Inui in view of Applicant's alleged admission of prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

With reference to independent Claim 1, the present invention relates to a shielded cable which includes first signal wires for transmitting relatively high frequency signals, second signal wires for transmitting relatively low frequency signal wires, and an outer shield which covers the first and second signal wires. One feature of the present invention lies in the placement of the first signal wires within the cable. Each of the first and second signal wires is bundled in a state of being electrically insulated from each other with an insulation sheath. In addition, the first signal wires are placed so that they are directly adjacent to the outer shield and directly adjacent to one another. In this way, the impedance of the first signal wires is stabilized, and radiant noise is reduced.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the feature of independent Claim 1, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature that the first signal wires are placed directly adjacent to the outer shield and directly adjacent to one another.

Inui relates to an electronic device connection cable. Inui is seen to teach an electronic device connection cable 201 that contains high-speed signal lines 301 (including signal lines 302 and clock lines 303), low-speed signal lines 304, and ground lines 305 (column 8, lines 24-33; Figure 2). Inui further teaches that electronic device connection cable 201 contains a woven metal shield 313 (column 8, lines 39-41; Figure 2). The Office Action equates Inui's high-speed signal lines 301 with the first signal wires of the present invention.

However, as seen in Figure 2 of Inui, high-speed signal lines 301 are not seen to be arranged directly adjacent to the outer shield and directly adjacent to one another. Inui shows that high-speed signal lines 301 are interspersed throughout the cable and placed adjacent to ground lines 305. No two of Inui's high-speed signal lines are seen to be directly adjacent each other and directly adjacent an outer shield.

The Office Action stated that it had given the claim language the broadest reasonable interpretation. More specifically, the Office Action interpreted adjacent as meaning "being close to" or "nearby". The Office Action contended that Inui's arrangement fits this definition of adjacent. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nonetheless, the claims have been amended to read "directly adjacent" so as to further clarify the positional relationship of the first signal wires and the outer shield.

The Office Action further contended that “Applicant has not stated that all of the first signal wires must be adjacent to the shield and each other, and secondly, whether there may be two sets of first signal wires, which Inui clearly illustrates.” In this regard, the claims are seen to simply state that the shielded cable comprises first signal wires for transmitting digital signals of a relatively high frequency, wherein said first signal wires are placed directly adjacent to said outer shield and directly adjacent to one another. Neither of Inui’s sets of high-speed signal wires are seen to teach this feature of the claims. The outer ring of Inui’s high-speed signal wires is not seen to teach this feature, as no two of Inui’s high-speed lines are directly adjacent each other, but rather are interspersed with ground lines. The inner ring of Inui’s high-speed signal wires also does not teach the feature of the claims, as no signal wire is seen to be directly adjacent an outer shield (see Figure 2).

As such, Inui is not seen to teach first signal wires for transmitting digital signals of a relatively high frequency, wherein the first signal wires are placed directly adjacent to an outer shield and directly adjacent to one another. Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claim 1 is believed to allowable over the applied reference.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. In this regard, Claims 5 to 8 have been newly-added so as to recite that the first signal wires are in contact with the outer shield and with each other, as suggested on page 7 of the Office Action. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional

aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. O'Neill
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 86287v1